

II. REMARKS

GENERAL REMARKS

Claims 1-72 are pending. Claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 53 have been amended and are fully supported by the originally filed specification. In particular, claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 53 call for an overflow row to be stored across two or more pages of memory in a source table. This is supported by ¶ [0003] of the original specification. In addition, claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 53 call for unloading an identified overflow row into storage and loading the row from storage, which is supported by ¶¶ [0016] & [0018] of the original specification.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 112

Claims 1-72 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph, for being indefinite because independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58 recite “overflow row repair” in the preamble but the body apparently merely loads previously unloaded identified overflow rows. In addition, claims 1-72 stand rejected because it is not clear in the independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58 how loading of identified overflow rows can be accomplished if they have been deleted.

To alleviate the Examiner’s concerns and to clarify the claims, Assignee has amended the claims to improve their readability. In particular, each independent claim 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58 calls for identifying an overflow row that is stored across two or more pages of memory in the source table, unloading only the identified row into storage, deleting the unloaded row from the source table, and then loading the previously unloaded row from storage into the source table such that the loaded row is not stored across two or more pages of memory in the source table. As amended, the independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58 therefore indicate how overflow repair is accomplished and indicate how storage is used in the unloading, deleting, and loading.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Assignee here only justifies the patentability of the independent claims (*i.e.*, claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58). As the Examiner will appreciate, should these independent claims be patentable over the prior art, dependent claims would also necessarily be patentable. Accordingly, Assignee does not separately discuss the patentability of the dependent claims, although Assignee reserves the right to do so.

Independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Sockut (1997) in view of Lin (2000). However, Sockut in view of Lin fails to teach or suggest each and every claimed element of independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58.

Sockut teaches reorganizing an “area being reorganized” and specifically refers to such an area as an entire tablespace or partition on which reorganization operates. Sockut at 4 (7th ¶).^{*} In fact, Sockut explicitly and repeatedly describes unloading an entire tablespace or partition *en masse* into an unload file. See e.g., *Id.* at 1 (Abstract), 2 (2nd ¶), 4 (7th ¶), 5 (1st, 3rd and 4th full ¶), 6 (1st and 7th full ¶), 10 (7th ¶), 11 (1st ¶), and Figs. 4 and 6. Consistent with this reorganization, Sockut unloads data in *an old copy of the tablespace or partition* into the unload file and then reloads records from the unload file into *a new copy*. See Sockut at 11. Thus, Sockut operates squarely according to the prior art as described in Assignee's “Background” section in which prior art overflow reformation techniques (1) unload a complete table, (2) reload the data into a new copy of the table, and (3) replace the old table with the new table. See Specification at ¶ 6 and Fig. 1.

In contrast, Assignee's claims call for unloading ***only*** identified overflow rows from a source table, deleting them from the source table, and then loading the previously unloaded overflow rows back into the same source table. By doing so,

^{*} As is common in the art, Sockut defines a table space as “a region of storage that stores the data records for one or more tables.” Sockut at 2 (9th ¶). Also as common in the art, Sockut describes a partitioned table space as one in which “the table space ... [is divided] ... into partitions according to values of the indexed key ... Partitions reside in separate files, whereas a nonpartitioned table space can reside in one file.” Sockut at 4 (1st ¶).

Assignee's claims expressly do not claim the act of unloading data in an old copy of an area to be reorganized and loading the unloaded data into a new copy of the area as disclosed in Sockut.

Lin fails to provide the limitations missing from Sockut. In particular, Lin fails to teach or suggest repairing overflow rows by identifying an overflow row, unloading it from a source table into storage, deleting it from the source table, and loading it from storage into the source table such that the loaded row is not stored across two or more pages of memory. In fact, Lin describes how a record of an *overflow user* (an inactive user) in a full database having mobile communication users can be deleted and how the storage for that deleted record can then be used to store another mobile communication user's information. See Lin at pg. 523 (Algorithm O-I). Consequently, Lin simply discloses how to replace information for one record in a full database with new information. This teaches nothing directed to repairing overflow rows stored across two or more pages of memory in a source table, as in Assignee's claims.

For at least these reasons, Sockut in view of Lin fails to anticipate independent claims 1, 17, 28, 43, and 58. In any event, Assignee also fails to see how one skilled in the art would even be motivated to combine Sockut and Lin. Sockut is directed to reorganization of a tablespace or partition. In stark contrast, Lin deals visitor location registers used to retrieve information for handling mobile calls (Lin at pg. 520) and simply describes how old information in a register database can be deleted so new information can be added (Lin at pg. 523). Thus, Lin does not appear to be reasonably pertinent because it deals with nonanalogous art that would not logically commend itself to be combined with Sockut. See MPEP 2141.01(a)(I).

CONCLUSION

No fees are believed due at this time. The undersigned representative requests any extension of time that may be deemed necessary to further the prosecution of this application. Should any fees be due for any reason, the undersigned representative authorizes the Commissioner to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 501922, referencing 149-0168US.

* * * * *

To facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner directly contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion, reconsideration, and allowance of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean McDermott/
Reg. No. 49,000

Submitted Electronically Via EFS Web

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch, Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
Customer No. 29855
20333 SH 249, Suite 600
Houston, Texas 77070
Voice: 832-446-2400